

REMARKS:

Status of claims and amendments

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. In the Office Action dated March 1, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Morgan et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In this amendment, claim 1 was amended to include the subject matter of original claim 2. Claim 2 was canceled. Claim 3 was amended to depend from amended claim 1 rather than canceled claim 2. No new matter was added.

The 102(e) rejection of original claim 2, amended claim 1

The Examiner referred to FIGs. 1 and 12 of Morgan as allegedly disclosing plural components wherein at least two of the components are interconnected with each other such that if a state of one of the interconnected components is determined, states of other interconnected components are automatically determined. However, regarding FIG. 12, the entire process step 308 shown takes place within the controller 22 (column 16, lines 31-37), therefore this FIG. cannot possibly be construed as disclosing components interconnected with each other. Regarding FIG. 1, the only interconnections shown (not numbered in FIG. 1 but corresponding to reference numeral 25 in FIG. 2) "are used to interconnect...subsystems with the central controller 22" (column 5, lines 35-37), not with each other. Neither of these FIGs. discloses or suggests "at least two of the components are interconnected with each other such that if a state of one of the interconnected components is determined, states of other interconnected components are automatically determined." On the contrary, Morgan discloses that "each of the subsystems is capable of being controlled only by the controller 22" (column 4, lines 58-60). There is simply no suggestion in Morgan to have at least two of the components interconnected with each other such that if a state of one of the interconnected components is determined, states of other interconnected components are automatically determined. Thus claim 1, as well as its dependents, claims 3-4, are patentable over Morgan.

Conclusions

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Authorization is granted to charge any outstanding fees due at this time for the continued prosecution of this matter to Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP Deposit Account No. 50-0310 (matter no. 060944-0148).

Respectfully submitted,



Jessica C. Stahnke (Reg. No. 57,570)

for

Thomas D. Kohler (Reg. No. 32,797)

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

One Market, Spear Street Tower

San Francisco, CA 94105

415.442.1000

May 31, 2006

Date